

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CHRISTINE HENDERSON, et al.,

Case No. 6:22-cv-183-MC

Plaintiffs,

JUDGMENT

v.

FULL ACCESS BROKERAGE FAB, et al.,

Defendants.

---

MCSHANE, Judge:

Plaintiff, who has filed numerous pro se action in this district, files a similar action alleging “QUI TAM-WHISTLE BLOWING ON MEDICAID AND MEDICARE FRAUD.” Compl. 2. Plaintiff failed to pay a filing fee and failed to apply for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court is unable to make out any whistleblowing claim. Instead, the allegations are similar to those previously raised by Plaintiff; i.e., allegations detailing her fight with state agencies regarding her ability to act as a third-party’s guardian. Despite the Complaint’s length, Plaintiff fails to set forth any allegations supporting specific factual allegations regarding fraud. Instead, the Complaint merely alleges Plaintiff disagreed with actions taken by the agency. The mere allegation that Plaintiff disagrees with the agency’s attempt to garnish Patrick’s disability payments, as alleged on page 13, does not state a claim for fraud. That Plaintiff Henderson apparently lost in small claims court, as alleged in Paragraph 57, does not mean she may merely dress up those claims in a federal fraud action. That OHDS “BLOCKED” Plaintiff Henderson’s attempt to act as Patrick’s guardian, as alleged in Paragraph 53, does not support a claim of fraud. In reviewing the Complaint, it is clear that these allegations are simply a rehashing of

Plaintiff Henderson's allegations in numerous other pending cases regarding Patrick's care.

There are no specific factual allegations necessary to support a claim of fraud regarding the who, what, when, where, and how of a scheme to defraud the federal government. Instead, these allegations, like Plaintiff Henderson's other allegations in numerous pending actions, merely outline here disagreements with state agencies over the quality of Patrick's care.

As Plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee, failed to apply for in forma pauperis, and fails to state a claim, this action is DISMISSED. Additionally, the Court finds this Complaint is duplicative of numerous other pending actions filed by Plaintiff Henderson.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED this 9th day of February, 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Michael McShane  
Michael McShane  
United States District Judge